

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 7 and 13 are canceled without prejudice. New claims 16 and 17 are added. Claims 1-6, 8-12, and 14-17 are pending in this application.

35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 7 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection and submits that the use of degenerated messages or a degenerate case of the PKCS #7 syntax does comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Nonetheless, in order to expedite prosecution, claims 7 and 13 are canceled without prejudice.

Applicant respectfully requests that the §112 rejections be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,697,824 to Bowman-Amuah (hereinafter "Bowman"). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-3 are not anticipated by Bowman.

Bowman is directed to a system and method for interacting with a user over a network for personalizing a website (see, col. 2, lines 16-17). As discussed in the Abstract of Bowman, a user is identified and information about the user is collected. A profile of the user is built based on the collected information and a plurality of different contents are managed. The profile and the contents are analyzed in order to match attributes of the profile of the user and attributes of the contents. The contents which have attributes that match the attributes of the

profile of the user are then selected and delivered to the user. The user is allowed to manually select which of the delivered contents are depicted on a display. The user is also allowed to selectively position the delivered contents on the display.

In contrast, claim 1 recites, in part:

transmitting a request for an enrollment certificate for a virtual private network to a registration authority operating independently of a certificate authority.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such transmitting as recited in claim 1 is disclosed in Bowman.

In the August 25 Office Action at ¶5, p. 3, Bowman at col. 75, line 65 through col. 76, line 12 is cited as disclosing that a request is transmitted for an enrollment certificate for a virtual private network to a registration authority (RA).

This cited portion of Bowman discusses that encryption services are provided with a VPN, that a CA administers certificates, and that an RA is used to process certificate requests. However, there is nothing teaching that any of the certificate requests discussed in the cited portion are a request for an enrollment certificate for a virtual private network as recited in claim 1. Although a VPN is mentioned in this cited portion, there is no mention in this cited portion of any enrollment certificates for a VPN much less of where a request for an enrollment certificate for a VPN is transmitted. Absent such a disclosure, Applicant respectfully submits that Bowman cannot disclose transmitting a request for an enrollment certificate for a virtual private network to a registration authority as recited in claim 1.

Also in the August 25 Office Action at ¶5, p. 3, Bowman at Figure 40 is cited as showing the registration authority (RA) operates independently from the

certificate authority (CA) since they are remotely located from one another. However, Figure 40 of Bowman is directed to a different system architecture than that of Fig. 36 (which is the subject of the discussion at col. 75, line 65 through col. 76, line 12 of Bowman). Figure 40 of Bowman is directed to an Internet home banking architecture (see, col. 78, line 31), while the discussion in the cited portion of col. 75-76 refers to Fig. 36, which refers to a collaboration sample architecture (see, col. 75, line 37). There is no discussion or mention in Bowman of a VPN in Fig. 40. Absent such a discussion or mention, Applicant respectfully submits that Bowman cannot disclose transmitting a request for an enrollment certificate for a virtual private network to a registration authority operating independently of a certificate authority as recited in claim 1. The mere disclosure of a registration authority and a certificate authority remotely located from one another in Figure 40 of Bowman, without any mention of a VPN, cannot disclose a request for an enrollment certificate for a virtual private network to a registration authority operating independently of a certificate authority as recited in claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable over Bowman.

With respect to claim 2, claim 2 depends from claim 1 and Applicant respectfully submits that claim 2 is allowable over Bowman at least because of its dependency on claim 1. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Bowman does not disclose transmission of additional requests regarding maintaining enrollment in the virtual private network to the registration authority as recited in claim 2.

As discussed above, the cited portion of Bowman (at col. 75, line 65 through col. 76, line 12) discusses that encryption services are provided with a VPN, that a CA administers certificates, and that an RA is used to process certificate requests. However, there is nothing teaching that the certificate requests discussed in the cited portion are requests regarding maintaining enrollment in the virtual private network as recited in claim 1. Although a VPN is mentioned in this cited portion, there is no mention in this cited portion of any requests regarding maintaining enrollment in the VPN much less of where requests regarding maintaining enrollment in the virtual private network are transmitted. Absent such a disclosure, Applicant respectfully submits that Bowman cannot disclose transmission of additional requests regarding maintaining enrollment in the virtual private network to the registration authority as recited in claim 2.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 2 is allowable over Bowman.

Given that claim 3 depends from claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 3 is likewise allowable over Bowman for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 4, 6-8, 10, and 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,715,073 to An et al. (hereinafter "An"). Claims 7 and 13 have been canceled without prejudice, thereby rendering the rejection of claims 7 and 13 moot. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, and 14 are not anticipated by An.

An is directed to a secure server using public key registration and methods of operation (see, Title). As discussed in the Abstract of An, An describes a secure-end-to-end communication system for electronic business system and method of operation, e.g., the Internet, includes a web server-vault controller having personal storage vaults in the controller for users, registration and certification authorities. Each personal vault runs programs on the controller under a unique UNIX user ID. Data storage is provided by the controller wherein the storage is owned by the same user ID assigned to the vault. A registration authority running as a software application in the controller processes requests to issue, renew and revoke digital certificates issued by a certification authority using two pairs of public-private keys. The registration authority interacts with the vault controller to decide whether an applicant qualifies to receive a digital certificate. The certification authority running as software application in the controller includes a certificate management system that provides services such as issuing, revoking, suspending, resuming, and renewing a user's right to digital certificates.

In contrast, claim 4 recites, in part:

receiving, from a device, a get certificate authority certificate request;
generating a response including a certificate of the registration authority; and
returning the response to the device.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such receiving, generating, or returning as recited in claim 4 is disclosed in An.

In the August 25 Office Action at ¶6, p. 4, An at col. 12, lines 22-30 and col. 13, lines 50-52 is cited as disclosing a method implemented at a registration authority (RA) wherein a vault agent (device) sends a request for a certificate from

a certificate authority (CA). The RA receives the request and then forwards the request to the CA and the CA then generates a certificate (response) and sends it to the RA which then sends it back to the remote agent (device).

Applicant respectfully submits, however, that the cited portion of An does not disclose the receiving, generating, and returning of claim 4. An states that “the interaction between a vault agent and a vault process running in the controller begins in steps 1 and 2 in which the vault agent sends a request to an automated RA to issue a certificate” (see, col. 12, lines 22-25). There is no mention in An that the request is a get CA (certificate authority) certificate request. The mere mention of sending a request to an automated RA to issue a certificate does not disclose a get CA certificate request. Rather, the request in An is a request to the automated RA to issue a certificate, not a request for a CA certificate. Absent any such discussion, Applicant respectfully submits that An cannot disclose receiving, from a device, a get certificate authority certificate request as recited in claim 4.

Furthermore, in claim 4 the RA (registration authority) receives a get CA certificate request, and generates a response that is returned to the requesting device, the response including a certificate of the RA. Thus, although the device requests a certificate of the CA, a certificate of the RA is returned to it. Applicant respectfully submits that no such method is disclosed in the cited portion of An. In the cited portion of An, the vault agent sends a request to an automated RA to issue a certificate, the automated RA forwards the request to the CA agent which signs the certificate and returns it to the automated RA, which sends the certificate back to the remote agent. Nothing in this process described in the cited portion of An discusses requesting a certificate of one entity (the CA), but having returned to

it the certificate of another entity (the RA). Absent such discussion, Applicant respectfully submits that An cannot disclose the receiving, generating, and returning of claim 4.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 4 is allowable over An.

Given that claims 6 and 8 depend from claim 4, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 6 and 8 are likewise allowable over An for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 4.

With respect to claim 10, Applicant respectfully submits that, similar to the discussion above regarding claim 4, An does not disclose the receiving, generating, and returning of claim 10. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 is allowable over An.

Given that claims 12 and 14 depend from claim 10, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 12 and 14 are likewise allowable over An for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 10.

Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejections be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over An. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5 and 11 are not obvious over An.

Claim 5 depends from claim 4 and Applicant respectfully submits that claim 4 is allowable over An for at least the reasons discussed above. Applicant

respectfully submits that claim 5 is allowable over An at least because of its dependency on claim 4.

Claim 11 depends from claim 10 and Applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 is allowable over An for at least the reasons discussed above. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 11 is allowable over An at least because of its dependency on claim 10.

Claims 9 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over An in view of Housley et al. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9 and 15 are not obvious over An in view of Housley et al.

Claim 9 depends from claim 4 and Applicant respectfully submits that claim 9 is allowable over An for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 4. Housley is not cited as curing, and does not cure, the deficiencies of An discussed above. Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 9 is allowable over An in view of Housley et al.

Claim 15 depends from claim 10 and Applicant respectfully submits that claim 15 is allowable over An for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 10. Housley is not cited as curing, and does not cure, the deficiencies of An discussed above. Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 15 is allowable over An in view of Housley et al.

Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejections be withdrawn.

New Claims

New claims 16 and 17 are added.

With respect to new claim 16, new claim 16 depends from claim 4 and Applicant respectfully submits that new claim 16 is allowable over the cited references at least because of its dependency on claim 4. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not disclose a method as recited in claim 4, wherein the generating comprises generating the response including the certificate of the registration authority instead of a certificate of the certificate authority as recited in claim 16. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 16 is allowable over the cited references.


With respect to new claim 17, new claim 17 depends from claim 10 and Applicant respectfully submits that new claim 17 is allowable over the cited references at least because of its dependency on claim 10. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not disclose one or more computer-readable media as recited in claim 10, wherein the generating comprises generating the response including the certificate of the registration authority instead of a certificate of the certificate authority as recited in claim 17. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 17 is allowable over the cited references.

Conclusion

Claims 1-6, 8-12, and 14-17 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. Should any matter in this case remain unresolved, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone conference with the Examiner to resolve any such outstanding matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 2/25/05

By: 
Allan T. Sponseller
Reg. No. 38,318
(509) 324-9256